

**FAX****Date** 09/02/03**Number of pages including cover sheet** 6

**TO:** David J. Buttner  
United States Patent and  
Trademark Office  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-  
1450

**Phone** 703-308-2403**Fax Phone** 703-872-9311

**FROM:** Craig H. Evans  
DuPont Company  
DuPont Legal,  
BMP25/2128  
4417 Lancaster Pike  
Wilmington, DE 19880-  
0025  
U.S.A.

**Phone** 302-992-3219**Fax Phone** 302-992-3257**CC:**

**REMARKS:** ☐ Urgent ☐ For your review ☐ Reply ASAP ☐ Please Comment

A Response After Final for Application No. 09/960208 (Docket No. AD6597 US CIP) is attached.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 02 2003

OFFICIAL

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 1712  
PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN THE APPLICATION OF:

ROBERT JOSEPH STATZ ET. AL.

CASE NO.: AD6597 US CIP

APPLICATION NO.: 09/960208

CONFIRMATION NO.: 6480

GROUP ART UNIT: 1712

EXAMINER: DAVID J. BUTTNER

FILED: SEPTEMBER 22, 2001

FOR: HIGHLY-RESILIENT THERMOPLASTIC ELASTOMER COMPOSITIONS

**RESPONSE AFTER FINAL**

Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: Mail Stop AF

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated June 27, 2003, concerning the above-identified application, please favorably consider the following remarks.

**Status**

1. Claims 1 and 4 – 25 are pending,
2. Claims 6 and 7 are allowed,
3. Claims 12 and 14 – 18 are objected to, but would be allowable if in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and
4. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8 – 11, 13, and 19 – 25 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2164342 in view of Chen '321 or WO 98/46671.

Application No. 09/960,208  
Docket No. AD6597 US CIP

Page 2

Applicants' arguments filed April 28, 2003, were not found to be persuasive. Applicants respectfully request that their arguments be further considered in view of the following remarks.

Rejection – GB 2164342 in view of Chen '321 or WO 98/46671

GB 2164342 does not suggest inclusion of monomeric organic acids. Chen '321 or WO 98/46671 (collectively Chen References) is used as a basis for modifying GB 2164342 to include monomeric organic acids.

Applicants provide the following comments on the points made by the examiner in finding Applicants' arguments non-persuasive, respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

1. GB '342 has the necessary neutralization – GB '342 provides for a range of neutralization, but does, as pointed, out provide for 100% neutralization of the acid groups in the blends in Examples 2 – 5 (p. 2, ll. 49 – 50).

The examples pertain to blends of ethylene/acrylic acid copolymer (E/AA) believed to contain 20 wt.% copolymerized acid (p. 2, ll. 43 – 45), and a polyetheramide (p. 2, ll. 46 – 47). Table 2 indicates that the E/AA and polyetheramide are both present at 50 parts by weight (Examples 2 and 3) or that the E/AA is present at 70 parts by weight and the polyetheramide at 30 parts (Examples 4 and 5).

When the above blends are 100% neutralized (p. 2, ll. 49 – 50), one skilled in the art would expect that the E/AA would become an intractable phase in the continuous polyetheramide phase. It is this phenomenon (continuous polyetheramide phase) that permits the fully neutralized blend to be molded. It is well known that, without the polyetheramide, the 100% neutralized E/AA with 20% acid would not be moldable.

2. Chen does not teach metal stearates would not improve COR, etc. for highly neutralized ionomers – Chen may not teach such, but it does require that the ionomer be partially, not fully, neutralized (col. 3, ll. 65 – 67 of Chen '321). For the stearate to have an effect on the ionomer, the

Application No. 09/960,208  
Docket No. AD6597 US CIP

Page 3

ionomer must be melt-processable (see col. 4, ll. 16 – 19). A 100% neutralized 20% acid E/AA polymer is not melt-processable, so there would be no way to incorporate the stearate into the ionomer.

3. Highly neutralized ionomer/thermoplastic blend of GB '342 is processable even without metal stearate – Agreed, but the processability is because of the continuous polyetheramide phase (see 1. above).

4. Adding metal stearates to GB -342's 100% neutralized ionomer/thermoplastic blend, an overall neutralization of 100% remains – While this may be true, the metal stearate would not be expected to interact with the non-melt-processable ionomer, but would only be able to get into the thermoplastic portion (polyetheramide phase).

5. Adding metal stearates would be expected to improve performance – The art indicates that performance of a partially neutralized ionomer is improved. There is no suggestion that incorporating a metal stearate into a polyetheramide phase with no interaction with the 100% neutralized 20% acid E/AA would improve performance. Chen requires that the metal stearate interact with the ionomer for the improved performance.

6. Chen does not require the use of stearic acid (rather than metal stearates) with higher neutralized ionomers – Agreed, but it does provide for the possibility. While Applicants see no motivation to use the stearic acid instead of metal stearate, it provides the only possible (although questionable) way that the intractable ionomer phase of GB '342 might be interacted with. It is likely that mass transfer issues would limit the ability of the stearic acid to react with the cations of the 100% neutralized ionomer phase other than possibly at the edges of the intractable phases. Chen would teach away from the reaction since it limits "suitable ionomers" to those partially neutralized (10 – 90%). But, assuming that the mass transfer issues could be overcome, the level of neutralization of the ionomer would decrease (see Chen '321, col. 6, ll. 37 – 46) and would, upon adding 10 to 45 wt.% as

Application No. 09/960,208  
Docket No. AD6597 US CIP

Page 4

provided in present claim 1, be expected to fall below the 95% of present claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicants hope that the above more complete explanation of the position taken in the April 28, 2003, is helpful in persuading the examiner that all the claims as presently included are allowable. If further discussion is needed, Applicants' attorney will gladly visit the examiner or entertain a telephone conversation. The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' attorney by telephone at (302) 992-3219 if such would help in passing the case to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig H. Evans

Registration No. 31,825

Telephone: 302-992-3219

Facsimile: 302-992-3257

Dated: September 2, 2003

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 02 2003

PTO/SB/97 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0551-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

## Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted  
to the Patent and Trademark Office

on September 2, 2003

Date

*Jeanette Hancock*

Signature

JEANETTE HANCOCK

Type or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must  
identify each submitted paper.

09/960,208  
AD6597 US CIP  
Fax Cover Sheet  
Response After Final ( 4 pages)

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 02 2003

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments  
on the amount of time required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC  
20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.